



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

DURABLE MONOGAMOUS WEDLOCK

J. E. CUTLER
Western Reserve University

I. ANACHRONISMS IN THE AMERICAN HOME

A pessimistic view of monogamous wedlock is now current, and it receives confirmation from what appears to be an obvious interpretation of pertinent facts. It is true that the divorce rate in this country is presumably very nearly, if not quite, the highest shown by any people. It is also true that the average number of persons per family has been steadily declining decade by decade during the last fifty years, even though exceptionally large families have been added to the population in recent years through the fecundity of the foreign-born women. This large number of divorces and the rapid increase in the divorce rate, together with the noteworthy tendency in the native element in the population to commit "race suicide," seem, obviously enough, to warrant not a little misgiving as to the durability and permanence of monogamous wedlock.

But do these facts, and others of a similar nature that are now available, tell the whole story? It may be that we shall find on examination that it is a case of erroneous inferences drawn from detailed facts seen out of perspective. It may be that we are concentrating our attention upon symptoms and overlooking the seat of the difficulty. Perhaps our interest in individuals and their tribulations blinds us to great social and industrial changes now in progress of which these individuals are unwilling and, for the most part, unwitting victims. Surely it is a time when, if ever, serious consideration should be given to the history of human marriage and to the factors which determine the nature of the family as a social institution.

It is our purpose in the first section of this article to examine the general assumption, inherent in all of the pessimistic interpretations, that the permanence of monogamy rests upon the perpetuation of a particular type of home and of family life; and in the second

section, dealing with the new status of women, we shall consider what basis there is for the stability of the modern family as a societal unit.

In the discussion of the vicissitudes of the modern family, speakers and publicists commonly separate themselves into two groups. One group is concerned with the home as the dwelling-place of the family and urges "the housing question" as the vital issue in community welfare. The center of concern for this group is the complete disappearance of the single-family residence in the older sections of our great cities. The other group is concerned with the interrelations and the mutual responsibilities of the members of the family unit. The center of interest for this group is the rising divorce rate and the tendency toward "race suicide." It is perhaps unfortunate that these two groups are so sharply differentiated, assuming themselves to have nothing in common, when both evidently have what is essentially a common interest—namely, the perpetuation of the advantages which are believed to inhere in monogamous wedlock.

For our present purposes, however, it is convenient to follow this line of demarkation and to distinguish two component parts of the home: the family and the dwelling. Both are undergoing marked change and modification at the present time and both are involved in the question of the durability of our standard form of the marriage institution.

Our traditional idea of what constitutes a home is rarely a topic of conversation nowadays and we are quite unconscious of the fact that it produces a bias in our minds. To most American citizens home, no doubt, still means, traditionally at least, a house occupied more or less permanently by a single family (husband, wife, and children), with an adjoining plot of ground at the disposal of the residents. It depends upon the economic and social status of the individual whether this single-family dwelling be conceived of as a mansion, or as a cottage or bungalow, and whether the area of land surrounding the dwelling be large or small. But there is agreement that this single-family dwelling constituting a home is, or ought to be, owned by the family occupying it and that the adjacent land may furnish supplies for the family.

Such a household serves as an economic and social center. Economically it is largely self-supporting and self-sufficient. Food supplies and raw products are obtained from the land, and the members of the family carry on the necessary processes of manufacture and exchange, both sexes sharing in the work. This household is also a social unit. It serves as a meeting-place for neighborhood gatherings; it is the place where the young people meet socially and where courtship may happily proceed under parental supervision.

This we may properly call the Colonial type. It is splendidly typified in the home of George Washington on the banks of the Potomac. A visitor to Mount Vernon gets an impression of unity, completeness, economic self-sufficiency and social efficiency—an impression that it was a place which served admirably as a center of peaceful and restful domesticity. Usually it is not without a sigh of regret that the visitor returns to one of our modern cities. Cherished by our traditions, glowingly pictured in our finest literature, enshrined in our hearts, is this Colonial type of the American home. Popularly, at least, it is the standard, the ideal form of the American home.

But we find that an increasing proportion of the population is coming to live under urban conditions; and in the cities the single-family dwelling is becoming surprisingly rare. For perfectly obvious and valid reasons it is being replaced by terraces, double houses, flats, apartment houses, tenements, and lodgings. Many families—there is reason to believe that it will soon be a majority of all the families—are now living in these multiple dwellings, owning no residence and possessing no land. They have a right to use a balcony, a porch, or part of a veranda, some stairs and a hall, a section of the basement or the attic—and the public streets. There is no place for the children to play, without disturbing the neighbors or obstructing the traffic on the streets.

There is little chance for peaceful domesticity in these multiple dwellings. The streets are noisy. Some of the neighbors keep unseasonable hours and have vociferous pets. Others are amateur musicians. There are also pianolas, piano-players, and victrolas. Vacations are necessary in order to avoid nervous breakdowns,

and these vacations must be spent away from home. Sundays and holidays must be spent in an automobile or on a trolley car. Isolated security, rest, and recuperation are not to be found at home. All must go away when they are in search of pleasure and recreation.

The domestic arts are now largely factory processes. There is almost no sex division of labor in the household, for there are left to it none but the "sweated trades." To contribute to the support of the family it is necessary for both sexes to work away from home and become wage-earners. No longer is the household a self-sufficient unit, either socially or economically.

And these multiple dwellings in our cities are not satisfactorily adapted to the domestic needs of families. It is argued that people sleep in the dark, and that therefore a bedroom needs no window. Children are a nuisance in a multiple dwelling; therefore make no provision by means of which they may be less of a nuisance. Non-resident owners and absentee landlords are not primarily interested in building and maintaining ideal American homes. When people build houses for other people to live in and maintain them as an investment for immediate dividends, these dwellings are not likely, in the ordinary course of human events, to be the best possible places for families to live in.

It is evident that the modern family is suffering from unsatisfactory living conditions, but it is also plain that the Colonial type of home is an anachronism today. We must concern ourselves with a new type, or types, and we must consider a larger unit. We must put into the meaning of *home* something of its old Teutonic sense when in the form *Heim* it meant a village, or a community.

To get a satisfactory modern home in our cities it is necessary to establish standard building and maintenance regulations. The housing question and broad-gauge city planning are matters to be taken seriously. Comprehensive building codes, particularly housing codes, are to be drafted and enacted, and their enforcement insisted upon. And when we undertake not only the correction but the prevention of bad housing conditions, we shall find that we have to begin with the growing villages and the enlarging suburbs, and draw largely upon the police power of the state. If state factory inspection is necessary to protect the interests of people

at work, we have no reason to be surprised if it be true that state housing inspection is necessary to protect the interests of people in their homes.

In a number of ways the conception of a larger domestic unit is already finding expression and taking tangible form. There was a time when the provision of a water supply was an individual household matter. For an ever-increasing number of households it is no longer an individual or private matter at all. If the homes are to have an adequate, pure, and safe supply of water, it must come through intelligent and far-sighted community action.

Where isolated dwellings prevail, each household may confidently be expected to dispose of its waste matter in a satisfactory manner. Under modern conditions this is impossible and some kind of a sanitary system and organization must be devised which will perform this service for every household and all of them together.

Our food supply comes from widely scattered sources, produced under varying conditions and handled by numerous transportation agencies. We buy our provisions, meats, fruits, and prepared foods of the retail dealer. We buy and eat, on faith; we cannot know. Here is a modern city that gets its milk supply from half a dozen different states and thousands of farms. The individual household cannot possibly know about the purity and the quality of the milk that it uses. We must develop some community agency for taking care of this matter, some system of inspection that will be adequate and dependable.

The proper care of the sick members of the family is impossible in these modern dwellings. We are obliged, therefore, to take an interest in hospitals and their management. We discover that the modern hospital has a new and peculiar function, a community service, which was foreign to the work of the old-time hospital.

In brief, though we move slowly, because of our failure to discern the anachronisms in some of the standards and ideals which we cherish, we are learning that all the advantages of multiple dwellings are not to be secured at their maximum value without intelligent and persistent community action. We are learning, too, that there is such a thing as public health and that it bears a vital relation to the health and welfare of the members of the individual household.

Thus do the new types of dwellings modify our traditional views of domestic life. Equally important changes are to be noted in the organization of the household and of the family itself.

In the Colonial type of home the family formed a fairly stable unit. The relations and mutual responsibilities of husband, wife, and children were well understood. The family was patriarchal in organization, its headship being vested in the husband, who bore without protest the duties and the responsibilities of that position. Children were, both economically and socially, an asset, and they enjoyed all the advantages of being an asset instead of a liability. The school merely supplemented the home in the education of the children. There was a well-established sex division of labor. The women did practically all the spinning, dyeing, weaving, and sewing. They had general charge of the preparation of the food supplies and did much of the brewing and baking. The status of women was not questioned; it was in harmony with the customs and traditions of the time. The wife was subservient in a gladsome, womanly way to the head of the family. Only the unmarried spinster occupied an uncertain status, attested to by the fact that she has been popularly called an old maid.

In the modern family all of this has been changed; the relations of husband, wife, and children are no longer so completely patriarchal in character. The wife is much less subservient to the husband; not infrequently the bride stipulates that the word "obey" shall be omitted from the pledge in the marriage ceremony. A new order of things has altered the relation of woman to the institution of marriage.

In the marriage institution we really have a case of antagonistic co-operation. Neither party wants to enter such a permanent relationship unless there are distinct advantages to be gained. New ways of earning a living, therefore, make necessary a readjustment in the relations of the two parties. At the present time a revolutionary readjustment is in progress. A new alignment for the sex division of labor is being worked out. The entrance of women into wage-earning occupations gives them a stronger economic position, and hence the terms of the marriage relation are being revised.

The fact that modern manufacturing plants can do the work of the domestic arts more cheaply means that women cannot, if they would, all remain at home, spinning, weaving, making house furnishings, and preparing meals for a family. Some women, it is true, are still living under conditions which do not permit them to engage in remunerative work. As will be pointed out in the second section of this article, it is indicative of a change in the status of women that at present a part of the women are wage-earners and a part are not.

It cannot be doubted that, as time goes on, a larger and larger proportion of the women must necessarily work for wages in factories, stores, and offices. And they are, as a matter of fact, now entering practically all the branches of the modern factory system and the business world. They are also establishing businesses of their own and they are entering the professions. The unmarried spinster is happily no longer the traditional old maid; she is achieving an assured status as a business and professional woman.

What is new about this situation is not that women are working. Women have always worked. The new fact is that women are working for wages; they are becoming wage-earners. It was not so very long ago that men began to work for wages. Some important consequences followed that change. Now women are working for wages and still more important consequences are at length beginning to be recognized. It is becoming apparent that a new type of home and of family life is necessary. The old is no longer possible.

All that may be involved in the development of a new type of family life cannot be determined in advance, and opinions differ considerably at present regarding the possible advantages to be gained. There can be no question, however, that current tendencies warrant certain inferences.

If the married women go out from the home to work for wages, that seems to mean less care of the home, less care of the young children. No substitute has been found for a mother's care of her young children, but it is becoming clear that the educational agencies and curricula must be much more closely related to the needs of the members of the family. The boys cannot work with

the father. The girls cannot work with the mother. Neither the boys nor the girls have any adequate means, directly through the family relationship, of choosing or of learning a useful occupation. It is incumbent on the educational leaders to provide practical and effective vocational education and training in the schools, along with a considerable amount of vocational guidance. It is urged that emphasis needs to be placed upon the education of boys as home-builders and income-earners, while girls should be educated as home-makers and income-spenders. There are strong reasons, some of which have here been referred to by implication, for insisting upon the education of girls as income-earners. And it is evident, even to the casual observer, that both boys and girls might profit from instruction and training as income-spenders.

The modern home seems, on the whole, not to be giving to the children the very valuable moral training which was possible in the Colonial type of home. Agencies outside the home must therefore assume a larger measure of responsibility for this essential moral training, at any rate until the family as a societal unit becomes much more stable than it is at present. Both the church and the school are now with some deliberation and insight undertaking this task, and there is the promise of gratifying results, although here again the failure to discern anachronisms is a serious handicap.

If the girls and young women go out from the home to work for wages, the tendency is for them to be bound less closely to the home and to their parents. They come to feel more or less independent and their social life no longer centers in the home. Instead, it centers in dance-halls, moving-picture shows, theaters, and parks—public places of amusement. Hence it is necessary to exercise supervision over public places of amusement. In this matter of recreation we are facing a serious community problem, particularly serious because so few people as yet recognize the fact that it is a community problem. To seek fun is a perfectly normal and wholesome human experience. In our dance-halls and pleasure resorts the young people are seeking the fun which is not easily obtainable in their homes as now constituted, and they are being exploited for gain, often to their utter ruin and the desolation of future homes.

When both sexes are working side by side for wages, it becomes all the more important that the conditions of employment should receive serious consideration. We are now forced to concern ourselves with child-labor, the minimum wage, and legislation with reference to the employment of women. We must also know what the incidence of the risks of modern industry is upon the family and what is involved in the development of a proper and satisfactory system of social insurance. It is scarcely the part of wisdom to let the hazards of life fall most heavily on the weakest individual members and families of the social group, without any attempt to utilize the sound principles of insurance to distribute these risks widely throughout the whole group.

Again, it may be repeated, attention must be directed to matters of community welfare. A rural population, sparsely settled on the land, has become a dense population in an industrial environment. The family is no longer an isolated societal unit; it has become a constituent part of a complex and intricate community life. The cross-currents of this community life, if it be poorly organized and its potency misdirected, tear the family asunder. Those who would conserve the family need to concern themselves with the disordered social and industrial conditions which impinge upon a normal and wholesome life for husbands, wives, and children.

In general, the woman has had more to gain from wedlock than has the man. It is not surprising, therefore, that the woman has usually got the worse of the bargain. She has, for various reasons, been the weaker party, and hence not in a position to dictate terms; she has generally accepted the larger measure of the disadvantages. Our existing laws on domestic relations represent an attempt measurably to safeguard the woman, in recognition of her weaker position and her handicaps. As she gains a position of economic independence, she has less need of statutory guardianship in the domestic relation and the basic terms of wedlock must be altered somewhat in her favor. Chivalrous attention and care are no longer the full measure of compensation for the burden of child-bearing which falls the more heavily on her. She is insisting that she shall determine whether and how often she shall assume that burden.

The issue at stake here is whether the long-established property right in women shall continue to prevail. There is little doubt what the outcome will be ultimately, but no one can measure the amount of misunderstanding and recrimination, of abject human misery for numbers of people of both sexes, that will attend the determination of the issue. The great task which the man faces is the curbing of his masculine possessiveness; the great task for the woman is the intelligent assumption of the duties and responsibilities which go with her altered position.

The nature of the family as a social institution is not dependent upon ecclesiastical pronouncement, royal edict, or legislative enactment. There are some things you cannot force a society to do, any more than an individual. You cannot by legislation, or by any form of compulsion, force men to be ambitious, to be energetic, or to be good and honest and true. No more can you by legislation compel a society to maintain an ideal marriage institution. It has never been true that the standard form of wedlock has had no departures from it. In between the simplest pairing arrangement of short duration and pair-marriage for life we find numerous variations in the family relations of the sexes, and these variations are to a greater or less degree always present. Side by side with polyandry and with polygyny, monogamy is found. Where group marriage prevails, other forms are not wholly absent. Monogamy (pair-marriage for life) has never succeeded, even with the powerful sanction of Christianity behind it, in obtaining the unvarying adherence of all classes and every individual member of society.

The marriage institution is distinctly a social institution, one that is controlled by the customs, standards, and ideals of society. It lies in the mores. Its existence, its continuance, and the terms on which the marriage relation may be dissolved are really determined by the conditions of life, and by the standards and ideals which characterize the society in question. If wedlock is regarded as merely a social convenience, at a time when conditions are in many ways unfavorable to the maintenance of high-grade family life, as is true at present, divorce, or something which is practically the same thing, will be common. If wedlock has a solid basis in mutual interests for the parties concerned, and

especially if, in addition, it is regarded as a holy union to be dissolved only by conditions extremely unfavorable for its continuance, then divorces and separations will be rare.

The family as a societal unit is now in a period of transition, a period of essential and thoroughgoing readjustment. The acute condition of the servant problem indicates this, as does also a number of other matters frequently discussed at dinners, bridge parties, and afternoon teas. Most people are at present giving their attention to the symptoms of this transition. They are studying desertions and divorces, when they ought to be studying the marriage institution and the family. They are seeking a remedy for divorce and for the social evil, when they might much more profitably be seeking a new basis for the stability of the family in accord with a higher status for the woman and be devoting themselves to the initiation and perfection of measures of community action that are essential to the maintenance of a modern home that will give to all its members a maximum of satisfaction. Wedlock must yield a profit in satisfaction of interests of the parties concerned, and there must be mutual advantages for the two sexes in order that the marriage institution shall be stable.

Some changes in the basic relationships of the family and of the home are inevitable and necessary at the present time, whatever the cost. It is certain that the cost will be heavy, measured in terms of human suffering and misery, but we can scarcely doubt that in the long run the gain will overbalance the loss—unless we have ceased to have faith in humanity. Ida M. Tarbell came close to stating correctly an essential truth, when she said recently:

The human heart does not change. It demands its mate, always has, always will; and the mated will find a corner to themselves where they can sit by their own fire and rear their own brood. Their corner may be a flat and not a cottage, their fire may be a gas log and not a bundle of sticks, their dinner may come in from the corner in cans and be heated and not cooked, the wife may vote and the husband may give himself a score of liberties an earlier generation would have frowned on, but what has all that to do with the foundations of life? These are but the fluctuations in ways and expressions which each succeeding generation surely brings.

Durable monogamous wedlock is not dependent upon the perpetuation of the Colonial type of home; nor is pair-marriage for

life conditioned upon the maintenance of the patriarchal form of the family. A study of the history of human marriage shows that this institution has in the past undergone many changes and modifications. Just now another notable change is in progress. Monogamous wedlock is not threatened with extinction, nor is its durability fatally impaired; but it is undergoing an essential and wide-reaching adaptation to new life conditions. Prominent as a factor in this adaptation, perhaps the most prominent factor of all, is the change in the status of women. In the next section we shall consider the bearing of the new status of women on the stability of the modern family.

II. THE NEW STATUS OF WOMEN

In general, the status of women has been controlled, in all civilization up to the highest, by their power to help in the work of life. Where women have had important functions they have been valued; where they have needed protection and support, and have not been able to contribute much, they have been treated with contempt. If the economic situation is strong, so that each man can pay a good price for a wife, girls are valuable; in the contrary case female infanticide arises. If the women's contribution to the food supply is essential, women are well treated; while if the men are warlike meat-eaters [their own providers, therefore], they treat women as drudges, tempering the treatment with respect for them as necessary mothers of warriors. Among nomads the status of women is low, and women, children, and the aged are regarded as burdens. The two former are necessary, but all are treated capriciously. Under agriculture women win a position of independent co-operation. When towns are built women incur dangers on the streets and complications arise; their position in rural life is then far more free than in towns. Public security in the latter once more changes the case. When women are valued for grace and beauty and are objects of affection, not means of gain, they win, as compared with earlier stages.

Thus did the late Professor W. G. Sumner cogently summarize the history of the status of women. With his usual sagacity and insight he also at the same time indicated the boundary lines within which the new status of women is to be achieved. Perhaps the time is not propitious for a full characterization of the new status; perhaps we are as yet too closely involved in the complicated phenomena which surround its achievement; but in certain innovations and observable tendencies there are foreshadowings, at

least, of a different and somewhat more responsible status than women have hitherto known.

The fact that society propagates itself by the co-operation of two sexes is of tremendous sociological importance. To treat of the *socius* as the center or nucleus of societal relations is to deal with an absurd abstraction. There are two sexes, separate and distinct, in human society, and the dividing line between them is one which is never crossed. Men and women have never thoroughly understood each other and they do not today. The two sexes can never look at the problems of life in precisely the same way; the difference of sex gives them two diverse viewpoints. A common viewpoint is as impossible for them as a common gender.

This diversity of viewpoints gives rise to sex-misunderstanding and sex-antagonism, the fruits of which often ripen into bitterness in the divorce courts. A good illustration of male sex-misunderstanding is afforded by the author of a recent book who, at the same time, gives expression to some apprehensions about the new status of women.

No man [he says] should feel ashamed of being directed in most of his affairs by a wise, loving, and faithful wife. But few men can live happily with a female drill-sergeant. To say that there is no managing in marriage is to deny one of the plainest facts of life. Most women are born managers of men. And if men want to retain any of that freedom, which is at present their alleged exclusive privilege, they must learn how to manage women. It is always well for a man to remember of what plastic stuff he is made. The fine delicate fingers of the woman for whom he possesses an infatuation can mould him into a shape that he may not be able to recognize as his own image.

The current discussion of woman suffrage, composed as it is chiefly of arguments and counter-arguments that never join issue, offers many illustrations of both male and female sex-misunderstanding. The male point of view is commonly represented by the argument that, to exercise intelligently the right of suffrage, women must "forsake the home" and become "less womanly"; the female point of view receives its characteristic expression in the counter-argument of "simple justice and freedom for self-realization."

The woman suffrage movement is one of the battlefields, more obvious and spectacular than any of the others, where the achieve-

ment of a new status for women is in progress. On this battlefield is presented, in all the vividness and passion of popular discussion, the struggle of innovation and variation against the power of tradition and conservatism; and the inevitable background of sex-misunderstanding and sex-antagonism is always observable. The men insist that "it is the privilege of men to care for the women" (patriarchal tradition, reinforced by the chivalry of the Middle Ages), to which the women reply, "We do not ask it, preferring independence and equal opportunity through the use of the ballot" (the fetish of democracy, reinforced by current dissatisfaction and aspiration).

The status of women at any given time is the result of an adaptation between the two sexes, reached by an adjustment of the prevailing sex-mores to the life conditions. If the life conditions are altered at any time, a new adjustment is necessary, and the part which the woman can take under the new life conditions will largely determine her status. Woman has always been limited and handicapped in the struggle for existence by her child. To win subsistence has been no easier for her than for the man, and in addition her infant has claimed a portion of her time and labor. It has been to her interest to develop a plan of co-operation with the man through a marriage institution. But this marriage institution has also been of great advantage to the man, as well as to the woman, because it permitted a division of labor in the struggle for existence—a method of co-operative effort which has in the last fifty years so effectively demonstrated its utility in all branches of industry.

The facts of human history make us exceedingly cautious about saying that there are some kinds of work which women are not fitted to do. Every considerable change in life conditions in the past has resulted in a change in the sex division of labor. It is the nineteenth-century change in life conditions, which we call the industrial revolution, that is producing now a new sex division of labor and is thus altering the status of women. Some hundred years ago the economic effects of the industrial revolution became noticeable and students began to be interested in a new science—economics. Somewhat later the more circuitous but equally positive societal effects and consequences became evident, and people

awoke to an interest in *social* problems—this interest giving point and significance to the development of another new science, that of sociology or the science of society. We are now discovering, at length, not only that there has been an unprecedented increase in the rate of production of wealth, with all the problems connected therewith, but also that the system of wage or monetary payment for labor has been introduced and established, not for one sex alone, but for both sexes.

The absorption of the domestic arts by the factory system of production has left the “waiting women of romance” in a somewhat precarious position and they are by no means clear in their own minds as yet what course to pursue. It is not even clear to all of them that the alternative which they face is that of remaining at home with little or nothing to do, or of accepting the opportunity to work for wages outside the home, and the fathers and mothers seem often to be in even greater perplexity. The situation in which the woman college graduate not infrequently finds herself would be amusing if it were not so full of tragedy. After four years of self-reliant effort away from her parents, she is expected at once to be idly contented in a well-appointed home in the management of which her mother needs no assistance; and she discovers perhaps that her parents fail to understand in any measure why she should wish to do anything other than grace the home with her presence until she finds a man to marry—or until an acceptable man finds her.

Attention was directed in the preceding section to a fact which indicates that a change in the status of women is in progress—namely, that at the present time some women are income-earners and some are not.

Many of the women occupying the better grade of family residences and apartments are living under conditions which do not permit them to work, i.e., to contribute to the family income. These women are not permitted to work at anything that is remunerative, on account of the attitude of their parents and husbands and of the social standards which prevail. They are occupying, perhaps we may say, the position of ornamental fixtures in the home. Their function in the household is apparently to make themselves indispensable luxuries and thus keep the family together.

In a woman's college classroom discussion of the best way to finance the modern home, an attractive young Senior said that her idea was that, after all the household bills and joint expenses were paid out of the husband's earnings, each should then share equally in what was left. It came out in the discussion that the home she had in mind was a cozy little flat where she could make her husband happy and contented when he returned from his business tired out and cross. She had no plan for her time when she was not occupied in making her husband happy and contented. With the characteristic candor of college students, her classmates set her apart as "the girl who was looking for a man to let her spend his income and give him half of what was left."

According to the accepted social standards it is perfectly proper for the tenement-house women to assist in the maintenance of the family, but they have neither the necessary room nor the facilities to engage in remunerative work at home without endangering their own health and that of their families. Consequently a large proportion of the tenement-house women are now to be found working for wages outside their own homes. And, it may be noted in passing, even if the tenement-house mother remains at home to look after the children, she cannot really take care of them and give them the moral training which children used to get in the Colonial type of home. The children run the streets and get into mischief. She can provide practically nothing for them to do that is beneficial to them.

Plenty of evidence from census material, and from numerous other sources, is available to show that there are few kinds of work from which the female sex is absolutely debarred, either by nature, by law, or by custom. For the present purpose it is necessary only to refer to some of the facts about the employment of women in industry in the United States. In the census report of 1900 the detailed classification of breadwinners, with respect to the kind of work in which they were engaged, distinguished 303 occupations. Women were represented in all but 9 of these occupations—no women were reported as firemen in city fire departments, nor as telegraph and telephone linemen, nor as United States soldiers, sailors, or marines. But there were only 9, we repeat, of these occupations out of the whole 303 in which no women were reported.

According to the Thirteenth Census, in which a new basis of classification of occupations was used, out "of 116 principal occupations pursued in the United States in 1910" women were represented in all but 11. To those who, like the writer of a leading editorial in the *New York Times* a few months ago, are disposed to find "true objections to turning woman out into the everlasting scrimmage of life," it must be somewhat disconcerting to find that women were reported in 1910 following such occupations as lumbermen, raftsmen and woodchoppers, carpenters, electricians and electrical engineers, machinists, molders, painters, glaziers, varnishers and enamelers, shoemakers and cobblers (not in factories), coppersmiths, draymen, teamsters and expressmen, railroad foremen and overseers, railroad (steam and street) laborers, switchmen, flagmen and yardmen, mail-carriers, commercial travelers (2,593 of them), deliverymen, laborers in coal and lumber yards and warehouses, porters, guards, watchmen and doorkeepers, civil and mining engineers and surveyors.

It is an indication of a significant tendency that in many of these occupations, and in a number of others in which women were found in 1910, they were not represented in 1880. No women were reported in 1880 as officials of banks and companies, but in 1890 217 women were reported as occupying this position in the business world and in 1910 the number had increased to nearly 4,000. No women were employed in 1880 as powder and cartridge makers, but in 1890 there were 422 women thus employed and in 1910 there were 2,762.

Between 1880 and 1910 there have been notable increases in the numbers of women employed in such occupations as chemists, assayers and metallurgists, janitors and sextons, commercial travelers, packers and shippers, sales-women, street-railway employees, telegraph and telephone operators, undertakers, glass workers, bakers, millers, leather curriers and tanners, brass workers, clock and watch makers and repairers, gold and silver workers, engravers, bookbinders, photographers, upholsterers, as well as factory operatives in all the leading industries and such professions as architects, designers and draftsmen, dentists, journalists, artists, musicians, teachers, lawyers, clergymen, physicians, and surgeons.

The only general division of occupations, as classified by the census authorities in 1910, in which women outnumber men, was domestic and personal service; and they constituted only 4 per cent of the persons engaged in transportation, 3 per cent of those engaged in public service, and one-tenth of 1 per cent of those engaged in the extraction of minerals; but in professional service there were four women to every five men, one-third of the persons engaged in clerical occupations were women, in manufacturing and mechanical industries women constituted one in six, in agriculture, forestry, and animal husbandry one in seven, and in trade one in eight of the gainful workers. About one-third of all the wage-earners in the state of New York in 1910 were women.

In comparison with preceding decades there has been a considerably greater increase from 1900 to 1910 in the proportion of women engaged in gainful occupations, i.e., working for wages or on a salary. In 1900 one woman in every five was engaged in a gainful occupation; in 1910 nearly one out of every four was a gainful worker.

These facts are not to be interpreted as meaning that the women are becoming more industrious and ambitious, or that they are becoming less womanly and virtuous; they mean merely that the women are entering occupations outside the home under a system of wage payment for labor. It has been well said that—

woman is no larger factor in industrial life than she has always been, but the form of industry has changed. It draws her into great groups, and those groups collect in cities and manufacturing towns. We see her oftener than we did when she canned and wove and sewed in small isolated groups. She is more obvious. She marries, makes her home, bears her children. That which disconcerts those who observe her . . . is mainly that she talks, thinks, and wants things that apparently never interested her before.

The change in life conditions is altering her status.

Illustrations are at hand which clearly foreshadow the nature and extent of the altered status of women. A new code of conduct, corresponding to the new status, is already taking shape.

The mixed and unsettled state of street-car ethics offers one illustration. At the present time we have conflicting ideas as to what constitutes proper treatment of women in street cars. Shall

a man keep his seat while any woman in the car is standing and hanging to a strap? In many cities it is customary now for men to keep their seats, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Suppose an employer gets on a crowded car along with a number of his women office-employees or clerks. Now if they were men, they would of course expect him to take a seat, if he could get one, and keep it. That corresponds also to their relationship in the office or store. In the case of women, however, if he treats them as women used to be treated, he offers his seat. That means a reversal of the relationship which exists in the office or store. There they must do his bidding, run errands for him, write his letters, sell his goods for him. There he must have absolute obedience and quick compliance with his orders. A certain amount of work must be done. If one girl is too tired or too weak to do the work, he must get someone else. He must consider the woman worker as no different from the male employee. The question arises whether he shall maintain this attitude outside the office, store, or shop. Of course many employers avoid this question entirely by riding in automobiles.

But even if the street-car difficulty can be avoided, there is still the question of recognizing women employees on the streets. There is a difference in social standing. The old standard of conduct was for the woman to speak if she regarded the man as of the same social standing and if there had been a proper introduction. May the woman employee continue to exercise this prerogative? The question arises, Is business acquaintance and relationship a sufficient introduction, i.e., does it constitute a basis for a measure of social recognition?

Then there is the woman's side of the question. Suppose she pleases her employer, suppose she does her work so well that he wishes to show her some special courtesy or favor and he presents her with gifts—flowers, a box of candy, or theater tickets. That was the old way for a gentleman to show courtesy or favor to a lady. Shall the woman employee insist upon no courtesies or favors which have any social significance? Shall she insist upon nothing else than more wages, a higher salary, as a return for particularly efficient work or for a satisfactory performance of her duties?

There is no generally recognized standard in regard to these matters at the present time. Women's entrance into wage-earning occupations requires some new ethics concerning the relationship between the sexes in society.

And there is another aspect to this significant situation. The working girl, in general, has a lower social standing, i.e., well-to-do people do not regard it as quite the proper thing for a girl to work for wages or to earn her own living in any way—except possibly as a teacher. This is in accord with our traditions. Husbands do not want their wives to work, since possibly it might be interpreted as a reflection upon their own wage-earning ability. Fathers do not want their daughters to work. When two young working people are married the young husband tells his wife she must give up her position; he will support her; she is to make a nice, cozy home where they will be happy together. But this means an amount of leisure to which she is not accustomed. She finds it difficult to adapt herself to the new situation. No longer are clothing and house furnishings to be made at home. They are to be bought. The problem which the young couple faces is that of getting the money to buy them.

In the home of well-to-do people who keep servants the woman of the house becomes a manager chiefly, rather than a provider. There are no household industries. The household work has been reduced to a minimum and servants are employed to do this minimum. Here again the woman has the problem of using her leisure time. "Social duties"—a very modern term—have come to occupy an important place, i.e., engagements of various kinds outside the home—charitable, philanthropic, educational, club meetings, teas, card parties, suffrage meetings.

Even the English language must expand—as it hasn't yet—to meet the code sure to result from this change in status. This is indicated if we consider the effect upon forms of business correspondence when women enter business. If one has occasion to write a letter to a firm composed of women, he is puzzled to know what form of salutation to use. He cannot say "Dear Sirs," nor "Dear Madams," nor "Dear Misses." It doesn't seem quite proper to borrow a French word for use in an English business

letter. "Gentlewomen" is scarcely good form, nor is "Dear Ladies." Suppose the firm were composed of a woman and a man—Smith & Jones, Miss Smith and Mr. Jones—or The Jones Co., Mr. and Mrs. Jones.

In some of the gainful occupations in which women are now engaged they are still designated as men—e.g., draftsmen, clergymen; and many words that have hitherto connoted only the masculine gender must now be used with a feminine connotation—e.g., architect, dentist, journalist, lawyer, physician, commercial traveler, photographer. In connection with one of the new occupations which women have entered since the taking of the census of 1910, a new word has already come into use—policewomen. When it becomes necessary to modify the meaning of words in current usage and to form new words in order to describe what women are doing, it may fairly be said that they are arriving at a new status.

The gallantry and chivalrous consideration for women, which so distinctively marked a gentleman in the old days, is fast becoming an anachronism in modern business. It was a clever gentleman of the old school who, when he wished to tell another man, in a letter, what he thought of him, gave this dictation to his stenographer: "Sir, my stenographer, being a lady, cannot take down what I think of you; I, being a gentleman, cannot express it; but you, being neither, can readily divine it." Perhaps it was this type of gentleman that the editorial writer in the *New York Times* had in mind when he wrote: "At present . . . there is a strong and wholesome barrier which serves to keep women apart from men in the hurly-burly of life, to insure them courtesies from the opposite sex, to give them many precious privileges." It would seem, however, that this writer must be a poor observer of what is going on. He must have failed to observe the number of women in the crowds on the streets of our great industrial centers at the lunch hour and he must be strangely oblivious to such instances as the employment of women in buildings constructed for men only, where no provision whatsoever has been made for the women's convenience.

Those individuals, whose status is rapidly changing as is true of the women today, are ordinarily affected disadvantageously

and they suffer many hardships—and no exception has been made in this case in favor of the women.

It has been said that those who have benefited most by the innovation of women as wage-earners are the large employers of labor who offer wages to women which men would spurn. Women workers are no doubt being extensively and shamelessly exploited; it cannot very well be otherwise when they are obliged to pass at once from the position of adornments in the home, with no adequate preparation and training for their new kind of work. They are sadly in need of education as income-earners, but this it is difficult to obtain when many occupations that they are entering have not yet received, for them, the stamp of social approval. Even our census authorities say that one of the factors influencing the proportion of women among gainful workers is the existence of industries which furnish "suitable employment for females." In taking up new occupations the women are obliged to combat the current notion that these occupations are not *suitable* for women. One of the handicaps that women have at present in business, particularly if they are dealing chiefly with women, is that they must "chat awhile." The tendency is still strong among the young women not to accept the life of a wage-earner as a final fact but as a mere interval between school and marriage. In some cases married women have shown themselves more independent and disinclined to accept low wages when offered, more disposed to grumbling and making complaints to employers, with the result that many employers prefer those who are unmarried.

There is substantial evidence, however, that women are slowly winning their way, not only as industrial wage-earners, but also in the business and professional world. Their presence as income-earners is regarded less and less in the light of an innovation and they are coming to occupy a position of recognized independence and competence. They are developing self-reliance and common standards as to hours and conditions of work and rate of pay. They are becoming direct contributory factors once more in the struggle for existence and are thereby gaining a higher status and avoiding the degeneracy which follows luxurious idleness, as well as the

fretfulness, depression, and morbidity which attend insufficient employment of brain and body. Common observation gives a measure of general application and credibility to the remark of an elderly gentleman who said to a friend: "While my wife was having babies she was quite contented and happy, and found full employment. Now that the children have grown up, she is capricious, dissatisfied with life, and full of worries."

The self-possession and worldly wisdom which women gain in remunerative occupation outside their own homes are giving them far better protection than an abject reliance upon the chivalry of men. Nor are they any the less womanly because they have ceased to occupy a merely adventitious position as connubial parasites, and are maintaining their self-respect as income-earners and actual participants in the work of life, with a keener perception, gained by having worked for it, of the value of money.

The economic equality of men and women has thus far perhaps become more fully established on the stage than in any other profession or in the field of industry and business. The difference of sex does not now operate in this profession against the women and in favor of the men in determining the amount of their remuneration. Actors marry actresses and both husband and wife continue to support themselves, assuming a joint responsibility for the maintenance and care of the children.

It is not essential, of course, in order that a woman may become a factor in the maintenance of the family, under a system of monetary payment for labor, that she shall leave the home every day at seven o'clock in the morning and return at five-thirty or six o'clock in the evening. There is more than one way under modern conditions for a wife to become a contributing partner in the home. Two illustrations, selected from the many that are at hand, may suggest the range of choice that is open. In a large city in the Middle West a husband who is a teacher of voice culture has a wife who for years has been the successful manager of courses of symphony concerts and musical entertainments. In an eastern city the wife of a leading florist has established a business of her own as a breeder of pedigreed dogs, and it is reported that in some

years she has made more money from her dogs than her husband has from his flowers.

"Woman," it has been said, "has been deified as the Mother of God, worshiped as queen, revered as priestess, honored as teacher, respected and protected for her maternal function." It is now an open question whether she shall achieve the full status of a wife. The notion of a woman as a *wife* is a very late one in the history of the human race and of the marriage institution. Woman has been a sharer in the primitive struggle for existence; among nomads, a servant and a drudge; with the growth of the idea of property, woman became such, occupying the status of a chattel or a slave; in the marriage relation woman has become a *mother*, not merely a slave or property. Her sex function has been socially recognized and she has been given a higher status on account of it. Chivalry well illustrates this conception of woman. It persists to this day. Many men argue that woman's function is limited to that of rearing children, as that is the noblest work to which she can aspire. The present emperor of Germany has said that woman's function is "Kinder, Kirche und Küchen." Many women complacently accept this as their position at the present time; but the fact is that women, in increasing numbers, are not content to remain in a status prescribed by social standards which grew out of the life conditions of the past.

No doubt there are many women who are more interested in the rights and privileges of the new status than in the duties and additional responsibilities which it imposes. Many do not see that there are any new responsibilities to be assumed. When a census-taker asked a woman in New York City for the name of the head of the house, she replied promptly and emphatically: "I am." When she was confronted with the question about the nature of her business, in a tone of utter contempt, she naively replied: "Why should I have a business? Haven't I a husband?"

Woman as a *wife* is a conception not fully attained by everybody as yet. It really is a very modern notion. The word "wife" seems to connote a high status, a position of large responsibility in the household, but after all, in fact, it has been interpreted as

meaning a position with restricted authority. The wife is more or less of a *silent* partner; she may act as a representative of the firm up to a certain point and no farther. It is a matter clearly at issue at the present time whether the wife shall be given, and whether she will intelligently and capably accept, complete joint partnership in the family. Many of the women are refusing to be *silent partners* any longer. They are breaking the silence and the result is the modern woman movement.

It may safely be said that the new status will place women in a freer but at the same time more responsible position. They will contribute as income-earners to the maintenance of the family and, as income-earners along with men, they will receive equal pay for equal work. The property right in women will at length cease to prevail and their general legal status will be modified in their favor as individuals, while the law of domestic relations will have to be very largely revised. The relationship of chivalry between the sexes will be less prominent, but in its place will be a much larger measure of mutual respect and confidence. The position of unmarried young women will be less adventitious in character, unrestricted to the one trade of pleasing men and becoming a wife (now said to be "a matter about which a nice girl does well to know nothing"), while they will win in the marriage relation the rank of competent membership in the family copartnership and the full status of a wife.

The present instability of monogamous wedlock results from an imperfect adaptation to modern social and industrial conditions. The family is not functioning effectively as an industrial and societal unit, and an adjustment is necessary in its basic relationships. This adjustment involves the entrance of women into wage-earning occupations and their participation once more in the support and maintenance of the family, through a new sex division of labor. It is not too much to say that wherever and whenever the family has functioned effectively as an industrial unit, through an accepted sex division of labor, it has been stable and has brought satisfaction to all the parties concerned.

The growing conception of the modern home as a domestic unit much larger and more inclusive than that cherished in our tradi-

tions, together with the fact that women in increasing numbers are entering wage-earning occupations and effecting a new sex division of labor which is rapidly gaining general recognition, may reasonably be expected to contribute to the durability and the permanence of monogamous wedlock. Such symptoms of instability in the institution of marriage as are now current are to be regarded as characterizing a notable transition period, the culmination of which will be a more perfect adaptation to the new life conditions and a new status for the women. This change in the status of women is not likely to be generally mischievous in its effects; on the contrary, it will very materially strengthen the coherence and the stability of the modern family.